



Meeting Summary August 9, 2017

Attendance

Panel Members:

- Don Taylor, Chair
- Bob Gorman, Vice Chair (excused)
- Hank Alinger
- Weiwei Jia
- Sujit Mishra (excused)
- Julie Wilson
- Fred Marino

DPZ Staff: Valdis Lazdins, Peter Conrad, George Saliba, Yvette Zhou

Plan #17-08: Eden Brook Age-Restricted Adult Housing

Owner/Developer: Donald and Frances Nahrgang

Developer: H&H Rock, LLC

Engineer: Fisher, Collins & Carters, Inc.

Builder: Ryan Homes, Inc.

1. Call to Order – DAP Chair Don Taylor opened the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

2. Review of Eden Brook Age-Restricted Adult Housing

Background

The 4.78 acre Eden Brook site is located at 8580 Guilford Road; across from the Kings Contrivance Village Center. The site is zoned R-12 and includes two existing historic structures - the Wildwood House and the log kitchen. Both are to be retained and integrated as part of a 24 unit, age restricted, townhouse community.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant gave a multi-media project overview and stated that 18 specimen trees, which are in fair or poor condition, will be removed. However, the existing historic Wildwood House will remain as a community center.

The proposed 24 townhouses are the Ryan Homes Griffin Hall model, which are two-story units with three bedrooms and a ground floor master bedroom. Their architectural features include gables, decorative shutters, and a variety of siding and stone veneer options. The Columbia Association (CA) has a ten foot wide easement running along Eden Brook Lane property line. The site is situated above and overlooks Eden Brook Lane, which suggested an entrance off Guilford Road. Stormwater will be managed with bio-retention facilities and perimeter landscaping includes willow oak and Leyland cyprus. Benches and colonial style lights will be used along paths.

Staff Presentation

All written public comments received in advance of the meeting have been provided to the DAP and the applicant.

Howard County Zoning Regulations require DAP review of all conditional use, Age-Restricted Adult Housing (ARAH) projects. DAP review and recommendations are one step in the conditional use petition and the subsequent land development review process. The hearing examiner will consider DAP recommendations when considering the conditional use petition. Section 131.0.N.1.4 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations specifies the criteria the hearing examiner must consider when evaluating a conditional use petition for ARAH development in an R-12 zone. Staff asked DAP to provide recommendations on those specific site design criteria. Staff also read into the meeting record the site design and landscaping comments submitted by the DAP vice chair, who was absent.

DAP Questions and Comments

Grading and Landscaping: Section 131.0.N.1.4.(a)

The DAP noted the importance of landscaping in age restricted communities and advised the applicant to carefully consider this. They also suggested a more natural perimeter landscape design and that Leyland cyprus should not be used.

The DAP recommended redesigning the internal pathways to improve the layout of the site and noted that connections to the Eden Brook Drive and CA pathways are very important. They encouraged the applicant to discuss an easement with CA that would allow an entrance drive off Eden Brook Lane, instead of Guilford Road.

Compatibility: Section 131.0.N.1.4.(b)

The DAP noted the architecture should better respond to the existing, historic Wildwood House and surrounding neighborhood. The applicant should consider buildings with front porches and rear-loaded garages to create a unique community identity. The site layout also results in long driveways, making maintenance and trash and recycling pickup difficult. Further, lots 9-13 and 14-18 could be shifted toward Eden Brook Lane, which would save mature trees and create an amenity space in the center of the development.

The historic home should be a community focal point; surrounded by an outdoor amenity space. The DAP also suggested the applicant redesign the layout to foster a community feel, with front doors facing front doors, and that a cul-de-sac be considered instead of the "T" road terminus.

Setbacks: Section 131.0.N.1.4.(c)

The DAP indicated that lot 24 was too close to the adjacent property and that a more appropriate setback could be achieved by reducing one unit in that area.

The DAP also encouraged sustainability principles to be included in site design and architecture and that open space lot 26 should be more effectively used.

DAP Motions for Recommendations

DAP Chair Don Taylor made the following motion:

1. Access off Eden Brook Lane should be explored. Seconded by DAP member Hank Alinger.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Hank Alinger made the following motion:

2. The site layout should be revised and units pulled closer to Eden Brook Lane, which would open up the interior of the site and allow more open space around the historic home. Also, increase the width of the buffer between the existing, adjacent single-family homes. Seconded by DAP member Julie Wilson.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Fred Marino made the following motion:

3. The architectural design of the units should be reconsidered to better reflect the needs of an age restricted community. The design of the units should be unique, to better fit the surrounding neighborhood; instead of the conventional design that is proposed. Seconded by DAP member Hank Alinger.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Julie Wilson made the following motion:

4. The site plan should be redesigned so that building entrances are oriented in a way to create a more positive streetscape, instead of all garage doors, and better public spaces. Seconded by DAP Chair Don Taylor.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Hank Alinger made the following motion:

5. Pathways within the development should connect to external paths along Eden Brook and the open space to the south. Seconded by DAP Chair Don Taylor.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Hank Alinger made the following motion:

6. Landscaping should be more naturalistic; by grouping trees and evergreens to create more natural looking buffers and interior plantings. Seconded by DAP Member Julie Wilson.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

DAP member Fred Marino made the following motion:

7. More attention should be paid to the historic structure as the community center and focal point, as opposed to the current design that just places a sidewalk to the front of the building. Also, consider indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, including a patio and landscaping to make it a beautiful location for residents. Seconded by DAP member Hank Alinger.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

Due to the extent of the comments, the DAP requested the applicant revise the plan and come back for a second review.

3. Other Business and Informational Items

There will be no meeting on August 23rd. An applicant submission is expected for the September 13th meeting.

4. Call to Adjourn

DAP Chair Don Taylor adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.